of teleological activity in the inorganic, their doctrine would be greatly strengthened.

Whitehead's assertion that ' mentality is merely latent' in physical and chemical events seems, I confess, a very dubious and ambiguous way of meeting this difficulty. What is meant by asserting the existence of mentality that is wholly latent and always has been latent ? If the alleged mentality" of the physical realm is and always has been wholly latent, is there any meaning in the assertion of its existence ? Is the assertion more than a verbal trick to smooth over or disguise the difficulty[7] of our fundamental problem—

What is the difference between the living and the lifeless ?

Myers seems to me guilty of a similar evasion of the difficulty. For, after elaborating the doctrine that goal-directed or teleological activity" is not confined to living organism, but rather pervades all the inorganic or physical world; also and equally, he yet recognizes truly mechanical activities that are not at all directive, and tells us that * living matter differs from dead and lifeless matter not merely in certain differences of mechanical activity, but also owing to the possession by the living individual of directive activities inherent in the organism, whereas in the lifeless world directive activity is external to matter'. And again, * Direction and purpose are similarly universal But whereas in the living universe they are largely inherent in the individual, in the lifeless universe they are only external—responsible for the history, order and evolution ultimately of both

universes *.

Stern also displays a corresponding vacillation in that having begun by drawing a broad distinction between persons and things, he fails to carry it through consistently.

Let us in this connexion remind the reader that we have